

South Lake Union Open House NOTES

Monday, June 12, 2006

The plan recommends rezoning the industrial commercial (IC) zone in the middle of the neighborhood so that housing can be built there. All existing uses would be permitted.

Should this be pursued?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, definitely – but some real incentives are needed to get developers to include affordable (below market) housing – Do <u>on-site</u> so there's a mix in the area. • Agreed (with above) – mechanisms to create housing for low-wage workers is very important. • Yes, do consider options for live/work space – or “alternative” spaces/dwellings. Consider experimental housing types/mixed use, etc. • Yes, IC zoning is too limiting and doesn't capture market demand for housing. • Only if current land owners have views protected to lake and Space Needle – Keep the view corridors on Fairview and Denny. • Yes, absolutely • Ditto. • Yes, long overdue. Let's bolster mixed here even more. • Yes – more diversity! • Yes – the proximity of residential and high density environment to the City Center provides greater benefit to the community. 	

The neighborhood has been split into 6 sub-areas:

Dexter, Waterfront, Fairview, Denny Park, Westlake, and Cascade.

Do the descriptions of the sub-areas make sense to you?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What about Gateway, which I think Vulcan is using?• Make some sense in terms of describing existing conditions – but what’s the purpose of creating these sub-areas?• Generally yes. Historic structures in other sub-areas resides Westlake. What will these sub-areas inform?• “Descriptions” yes – is there an intended design consequence to those sub-areas? i.e. zoning specifics per area, or specific design review requirements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Based on what information and research, cultural identity, public based-activity - or domain, are the titles suggested?• Seems a little geometric and arbitrary.

The new plan recommends allowing additional height and density for housing that meets multiple goals.

Are the height increases that are shown appropriate to explore in more depth?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but premature to propose heights or areas outside of neighborhood process. • Yes, but additional height considerations could apply to commercial and/or mixed-use building, not limited to residential, depending on the needs of the site. • Why study additional height in SM/R Zone around Cascade Park? (Do green streets and additional height have conflicting results.) • The Westlake area should include a strong housing component to support mixed-use/live-work/ and obvious adjacencies to the park, streetcar, and water – and not promote an office park environment. • Yes, anything for more of a range of housing for all incomes, especially workforce. • Yes, but need to consider born residential and commercial heights; think about height around Cascade Park. What about area north of Republican? • Yes, but it is <u>important</u> to include mechanisms that create housing for people with low-incomes – those working at low-wage jobs. • I couldn't be happier that there is a growing recognition of the benefits of tall and skinny and ground-related housing. (Plus pocket parks, plazas, and historic preservation.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – Areas immediately south of the IC zone currently limited to 125' height will have obstructed views at 6th floor and above if current 85' and 65" proposed limits are exceeded. View corridor to South Lake Union needs to be preserved/maximized for everyone. • Design Review concerned about massive structures. • Zoning height changes should be considered for other uses to help create amenities. • Should height pattern be an extension of existing Denny condo growth or be district pattern for a unique SLU? • Option 2 does not protect current land owners. • No! I live at Denny and Melrose, above the I-5 freeway – condo row and I will lose view of the Pacific S.C. Arches, EMP, Bottom of Space Needle and some view of Puget Sound – Too Tall!!! • Option 2 is scary. Option 1 is better • Option 2 destroys all chance of having any view corridors to the lake and to the Needle.

- Preserving views is worth considering, but so is making them! Look at all the wonderful views of the skyline from Wallingford, Queen Anne, West Seattle... Vancouver has similar topography and they are not scared of taller buildings. The new condos are beautiful. (But keep Kenmore Air!)
- Additional height should apply to all building types, including office, biotech, and residential.

A new idea being considered for other neighborhoods is the “Seattle Green Factor.”

Should this idea be explored for South Lake Union?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If this were accomplished through incentives, rather than regulation.• Yes!! We need the Oxygen!!!!• Yes!• Yes – makes living in Urban areas easier.• This should be voluntary, we would not want unintended consequence of making low-income housing development un-affordable (due to land costs).• Yes – subsidized if necessary; it is the environmentally responsible thing to do.• Yes – more livable environment. Therefore, more marketable.• Yes, this is a chance to create unique identity for Seattle.• Yes, we are after all the Emerald City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Green is good – clear implementation ‘incentivation’ is required.• Need to spend much more time with this, Green should be <u>City-wide</u>.

Please place a dot by the one view corridor that you think is most important.

View from Bellevue Place Viewpoint	7
View of Lake Union from Fairview Avenue N	7
View of Downtown Skyline from South Lake Union Park	6
View of Lake Union from Westlake Avenue N	4
View of Lake Union from Terry Ave N	3
View from Melrose Ave & Harrison Street	2
View from Cascade Park	1
View of Lake Union from Boren Avenue N	1
View of SLU from Galer Street Pedestrian Overpass	1
View towards Space Needle from South Lake Union Park	0

Should buildings be designed to maintain that view corridor?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To maintain openness – not concrete canyons. To maintain open sunny corridor(s) for strolling, sidewalk cafes, not wind-tunnels. <p>Also....</p> <p>The most important thing is to maintain rapidly being walled off all around. Driving along Westlake, Aurora, Northlake, and Eastlake, you hardly know the Lake exists. It's a zoning issue. If you zone tall buildings close together, they will come.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only existing protected views. Minimize new view corridors or view points. Right-of-ways will preserve corridors. No – R.O.W. will maintain – good design will appeal to view corridors. No new view corridors are required. Work with ones that exist. Ground level view corridors in R.O.W. are important, building massing is rarely required. To me, public ways are most important to consider, and not buildings.

Transportation Comments

1. Encourage growth (height/density) around transportation corridors, i.e. streetcar, major arterials, etc.
2. Future streetcar route – Mercer?? Probably Harrison is better.
3. Networks should be very pedestrian-friendly.
4. Transportation/pedestrian-friendly options should be safe and welcoming of women, children and elders.

I like the 2-way streets and change of character that implies.

Need more transit – better routing look at greater height/density around transportation corridors.

5. What specific infrastructure will be built to separate walkers and cyclists? The Westlake Ave. N. area has already become a frustrating area for fast moving cyclists and strolling pedestrians. This situation could become a nightmare with the addition of 16,000 S. Lake Union residents who are being encouraged not to drive. I see no plans or budget for dealing with this rapidly growing problem. Very irresponsible planning.
6. Please consider the influence of the streetcar, for operation success density is important!

Questions or Comments:

1. I probably say this every time... Like the Pearl District, I believe additional park 'spots' within the grid, not just at the edges (Denny P., S. Lake Union) are needed, particularly west of Westlake, if residential is going to rise & shine!
2. The 8000 household growth over 20 years seems low if 4000 of those are currently in planning – Suggest City look at impacts and opportunities for a greater number of households or range from 8k – 16k.

Is there an economic model/plan to verify viability of bonus system??

Is there anything that is missing from this plan?

- Include SLU Design Review with downtown. SLU has it's own Design Guidelines – it should have it's own Design Review Board.
- Poly Clinic/Hospital.
- A mini public park.
- I-5 pedestrian crossing at Harrison or Republican.
- Any mention of maritime heritage/Wawona or historic ships.
- I would like to save a smattering of historic houses from old Seattle. I second that.
- Center density around mass transportation (streetcar, Metro) Fairview, Mercer, Terry, Valley streets.
- Put City tax proceeds from development, utilization of infrastructure and Urban Design ahead of view corridors and floatplanes.